

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Cleophis Favor, Jr.,)	C/A No.: 3:20-3634-JMC-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Kershaw County Sheriff's Office;)	
Officer Jerry S. Barnwell; Kershaw)	
County Detention Center and)	ORDER AND NOTICE
Medical Staff; Kershaw County)	
Narcotics Team; and Nurse)	
Braxton,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Cleophis Favor, Jr. ("Plaintiff"), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Kershaw County Sheriff's Office ("KCSO"); Officer Jerry S. Barnwell ("Barnwell"); Kershaw County Detention Center and Medical Staff ("KCDC and Medical Staff"); Kershaw County Narcotics Team ("Narcotics Team"); and Nurse Braxton ("Braxton") (collectively "Defendants"), alleging violations of his constitutional rights. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civ. Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the district judge.

I. Factual and Procedural Background

Plaintiff alleges that on May 1, 2020, at approximately 10:30 pm, Barnwell assaulted him, slamming his foot in the door. [ECF No. 1 at 3]. Plaintiff further alleges Barnwell then refused to take him to the hospital. *Id.* He alleges he was further denied medical treatment while at the detention center. *Id.*

II. Discussion

A. Standard of Review

Plaintiff filed his complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss a case upon a finding that the action fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted or is frivolous or malicious. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). A claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed sua sponte under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). A federal court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se

litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). In evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of N.Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). The mandated liberal construction afforded to pro se pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts that set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 390–91 (4th Cir. 1990).

B. Analysis

1. Only persons may be sued pursuant to § 1983

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). In this case, Plaintiff names KCSO, KCDC and Medical Staff, and Narcotics Team as defendants. However, these defendants are not “persons” subject to suit under § 1983. A sheriff's department, detention center, or task force is a group of officers or buildings that is not considered a legal entity subject to suit. *See Harden v. Green*, 27 F. App'x 173, 178 (4th Cir. 2001)

(finding that the medical department of a prison is not a person pursuant to § 1983); *see also Post v. City of Fort Lauderdale*, 750 F. Supp. 1131 (S.D. Fla. 1990) (dismissing city police department as improper defendant in § 1983 action because not “person” under the statute); *Shelby v. City of Atlanta*, 578 F. Supp. 1368, 1370 (N.D. Ga. 1984) (dismissing police department as party defendant because it was merely a vehicle through which city government fulfills policing functions). Accordingly, KCSO, KCDC and Medical Staff, and Narcotics Team are subject to summary dismissal.

2. No personal allegations against Braxton

Plaintiff’s complaint contains no factual allegations against Braxton, and he identifies her only as “Nurse of Jail at time.” [ECF No. 1 at 2]. To the extent Braxton is sued in her capacity as the nurse in charge of the medical staff, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim under § 1983. The doctrine of supervisory liability is generally inapplicable to § 1983 suits, such that an employer or supervisor is not liable for the acts of his employees, absent an official policy or custom that results in illegal action. *See Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978); *Fisher v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Authority*, 690 F.2d 1133, 1142–43 (4th Cir. 1982). The Supreme Court explains that “[b]ecause vicarious liability is inapplicable to *Bivens* and § 1983 suits, a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official’s own individual actions, has violated the Constitution.” *Iqbal*, 556


U.S. at 676; *see Slakan v. Porter*, 737 F.2d 368, 372–74 (4th Cir. 1984) (finding officials may be held liable for the acts of their subordinates, if the official is aware of a pervasive, unreasonable risk of harm from a specified source and fails to take corrective action as a result of deliberate indifference or tacit authorization). Accordingly, Braxton is subject to summary dismissal.

NOTICE CONCERNING AMENDMENT

Plaintiff may attempt to correct the defects in his complaint by filing an amended complaint by November 12, 2020, along with any appropriate service documents. Plaintiff is reminded that an amended complaint replaces the original complaint and should be complete in itself. *See Young v. City of Mount Ranier*, 238 F.3d 567, 572 (4th Cir. 2001) (“As a general rule, an amended pleading ordinarily supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect.”) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). If Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the undersigned will conduct screening of the amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint or fails to cure the deficiencies identified above, the court will recommend to the district court that the defendants, save for Barnwell, be dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 22, 2020
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge